CONGRESS NATIONAL LIBRARY PERIODICAL DIVISION FEB 20 1918

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 9
No. 2

JUNE
1916

THE IOWA VICTORY

FOR PATRIOTISM AND PREPAREDNESS

WHAT WOMEN WILL DO IN WAR AND AFTER WAR

WHY SUFFRAGE WAS DEFEATED IN MASSACHUSETTS

SOME FACTS A SENATOR SHOULD STUDY

A "MESSAGE FROM WESTERN WOMEN VOTERS"

A DENVER FAILURE

SUFFRAGE AND JURY DUTY

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. A. J. George, Executive Secretary, Congressional Committee.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Nathan Kahn, Kate M. Gardner, Selma; Lida B. Robertson, Mobile; and Mrs. John F. Burns, Burnsville.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven; Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield; Mrs. H. H. Mason, Farmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

Organization Committee, Wilmington.
Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Douglas Putnam Birnie.
Third Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff.
Treasurer, Miss Alys Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Puller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Anne Squire.
Executive Committee, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., Mrs. Swager Sherley, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn, Mrs. Charles Hussey, Miss Josephine Patten, Miss Elizabeth Davis, Miss Murray Ledyard.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
Coresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor

IOWA

Office: 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines.
President, Mrs. Simon Casady.
Secretary, Mrs. Harry Phillips.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Rollins.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Alice French, Mrs. Leonard Harbach, Mrs. W. I. Hayes, Miss Kate Van Duzee, Mrs. Jane A. Crawford, Mrs. Mary Johnston, Mrs. C. C. Colgrove.
Advisory Committee, Mrs. N. E. Coffin, Mrs. John A. Graydon, Mrs. Richard R. Rollins, Mrs. Frank D. Jackson, Mrs. Harry Elliott, Mrs. Edwin Hewitt, Mrs. Leonard Harbach, Mrs. Harry Phillips, Mrs. Ralph E. Rollins, Mrs. C. W. Mennig, Mrs. T. W. Harper, Mrs. H. C. Alverson.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street, Portland.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George E. Bird, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. E. G. Abbott.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. David G. McIntosh, Jr., Mrs. Charles B. Penrose, Mrs. Jesse Slingluff, Mrs. William P. E. Wyse.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 611 Roland Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. S. Reed Anthony.
Executive Committee, The Officers and Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. James D. Colt, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. Curtis Guild, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Augustin H. Parker, Miss Julia C. Prendergast, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Miss Evelyn Sears, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier, Miss Ellen Tower, Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Mrs. Henry Preston White.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Secretary, Mrs. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. M. C. Peters, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. J. H. Butler, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Mrs. Wm. S. Curtis, Mrs. C. F. McGrew.
Mrs. A. D. Sears, Fremont; Miss Maude May, Fremont; Mrs. Charles Dodge, Fremont; Mrs. George D. Butterfield, Norfolk; Mrs. Fred W. Ashton, Grand Island; Mrs. S. H. Burnham, Lincoln; Mrs. John D. Haskell, Wakefield; Mrs. Conrad Hollenbeck, Fremont; Mrs. J. D. Whitmore, Grand Island; Mrs. Buchanan, Fremont.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Election of Officers on May 2, 1916
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Princeton; Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Paterson; Mrs. John R. Emery, Morristown; Mrs. Theodore C. Woodbury, South Orange; Miss Clara Vezin, Elizabeth; Miss Henrietta O. Magie, Elizabeth; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton; Mrs. Hamilton Fish Kean, Elizabeth; Mrs. William Libbey, Princeton; Mrs. Horace F. Nixon, Woodbury; Mrs. Henry M. Darcy, Newark; Mrs. William S. Stryker, Trenton; Mrs. Sherman B. Joost, Plainfield; Mrs. Henry L. Seligman, Elberon; Mrs. Thomas B. Adams, Summit; Mrs. Robert C. Maxwell, Trenton; Miss Elizabeth Kean, Elizabeth.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. C. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 804 Neave Building, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn. Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall, Mrs. Simeon H. Guilford.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland, Bellows Falls; Mrs. M. C. Webber, Rutland; Mrs. N. E. Phelps, Barre, and Mrs. Edward Wells, Burlington.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Otho G. Kean, Mrs. E. Randolph Williams, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. E. V. Valentine, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Mrs. Henry Harwood, Mrs. Hunter McGuire.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William L. Gray.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Coresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

THE IOWA VICTORY

THE Iowa election on June 5th was a close contest. The anti-suffragists won by a small majority only. Whatever consolation the suffragists are able to get out of this fact, no anti-suffragist would begrudge them. But the truth remains that our majority of 4,655 was greater than that by which the suffragists carried their largest State, California, in 1911, and the Iowa victory is undoubtedly the greatest we have ever scored—in winning at all.

The anti-suffragist had only six months to work in Iowa. The suffragists have been working for over forty years. We were facing one of the strongest, richest and best-organized political machines in America, fighting for its future with all the desperation of the attack on Verdun. Backed by coffers of gold, legacies, gifts, subscriptions and every form of money-raising known to man or woman; boasting that more than 600 out of 848 newspapers were on its side; with power to "muzzle" a large proportion of the press that it could not command; and with 250 to 500 speakers (Mrs. Carrie C. Catt claimed the larger number would be present) doing their utmost day and night for the "cause," the Suffrage Machine failed to take Iowa.

It is doubtful that any other political movement in this country, so supported with money, organization, skill and sentiment, could possibly fail to carry a State upon which it concentrated its entire forces.

If our meager funds proved more effective than the Suffrage Machine's tremendous campaign capital of more than a million dollars—they must have been expended wisely and economically.

If our less than twenty-five speakers overcame the arguments of over ten times their number on the suffrage side—the things they said must have been more than ten times as appealing to public opinion! If the few fair and manly editors who were willing to publish *both* sides in spite of all the pressure the Suffrage Machine was able to apply, were sufficient to offset the efforts of those who published thousands of columns of everything from vicious editorials to plate matter in the interests of the Suffrage Machine only—then our facts, our literature and our information must have been proportionately superior to that published by the suffragists!

SINCE we won, we can forbear mentioning the various things they called our workers; the insults that were hurled at our speakers; the despicably mean little things that often got into the editorial columns of suffrage newspapers, like:

"The anti-suffrage speaker here last night paid $25 for the hall. She did not take up a collection. Where do the anti-suffragists get their money?"

Every one of the States where there is an anti-suffrage organization contributed in some manner to the success of the campaign. Teas, luncheons, cake and candy sales and meetings were held by practically every branch anti-suffrage association in the country to help Iowa. Working women contributed parts of their salaries, other women denied themselves in various ways to protect Iowa women from politics. There were no large legacies, there were few rich women, there was no big campaign fund and there was no large single contribution on the anti-suffrage side. And the anti-suffragist who does not "take up a collection" a few days before election when she already has her expenses provided, compares quite favorably with the suffragist who does take up one at *every* meeting, even though her national organization has just inherited over a million dollars from one woman!

Even when the returns were coming in, some suffragist sent out a fake dispatch from Des Moines claiming that "equal suffrage won in Iowa to-day by 35,000 votes" and "only in the river towns of East Iowa, acknowledged to be wet in tendencies, was suffrage beaten." Not only was the "35,000" untrue, but the river town majorities had been wiped out at that time, no matter what their tendencies—and if the suffragists had won the rural vote they would have won the State.

We can afford to forget these flings now, although some of our women members of temperance societies who were called "whiskeyites" and worse may find it difficult to do so.

WITH more time and money, the anti-suffragists could have won a greater victory. Probably the strongest point scored by the antis was the cost and compensation argument. They were able to show from government statistics, in spite of suffrage efforts to distort the figures, that woman suffrage does increase taxes, and that it does not improve conditions nor offer any compensation to the State or to the women for the increased burden of taxes and the additional work involved in double suffrage. "You wouldn't hire two men—or a man and a woman—to drive a team under the impression that it would go faster or keep to the road better, would you?" was asked the farmer. The farmer, who does not lack astuteness, saw the point, which also appealed to the men in business and industry. In Iowa, the taxes there have increased greatly while the population has remained stationary. Consequently, additional taxes must show additional benefits to appeal to Iowa. The people know that the more they have to spend on politics and government, the less they have to spend on more personal needs. There are many things that women want more than votes and the turmoil of partisan politics.

IT was also demonstrated that there is nothing in politics that can compensate women for the loss of their prestige and power as non-partisans. Iowa is in the forefront in originating several good laws attributed to the efforts of women outside of politics. Iowa has the highest proportion of women in the United States engaged in the better paying professions. There was no opportunity for advancement that the suffragists could show that Iowa women lacked, or that the vote could give them.

AGAINST the logic of this appeal, the Suffrage Machine hurled regiment after regiment of fallacy, grievance, promise, pretense and accusation. But the *facts* held. Neither mass formations, frontal attacks nor all the political "big guns" they imported from other States could break through the anti-suffrage line of reasoning. Aided by "low visability," the suffrage sophistries sometimes scored a slight advantage when the anti-suffrage main forces were absent.

One anonymous coward paid for this libel in a Webster City paper: "The anti-suffrage interests, whose funds are swelled liberally by the brewers and saloon men, are careful to label themselves 'Society of Women Opposed to Suffrage'—and the poor men who pay the bills don't get a 'look in' on this title!—Political Adv."

If names and organizations were mentioned in connection with the work in Iowa, the PROTEST could be filled with the experiences of each speaker, the record of each branch and the things that each State anti-suffrage association did to help Iowa.

It was, in its final analysis, the victory of sound principles, of majority opinion, of earnest and intelligent use of energy, time and money that triumphed over the greatest odds and advantages of the Suffrage Machine.

The Machine did its best. It lacked nothing, and it left nothing untried in its attempt to defeat us. It failed. No amount of word jugglery, such as "you cannot lose what you never had" will suffice to explain Iowa as anything but a hard-fought but well-won Waterloo against woman suffrage.

In Mrs. Catt's own words two months ago: "Iowa is a strategic State. If Iowa loses, South Dakota will lose. If Iowa fails, it will be a tremendous blow to the movement in the United States."

Iowa was lost to suffragists, but won for women!

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. IX June, 1916 No. 2

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

OUR SUCCESS

WE expected to win Iowa. It is another victory for women over the sophistries of woman suffrage; our twelfth at the polls since 1912!

It was a question of getting out the vote and of having the voters informed on *both* sides. Whenever we have sufficient time and money to spread this information, it means an anti-suffrage victory, because the majority of both men and women think clearly and register a common-sense decision when they have the facts on any subject brought to their attention.

A man needs only a slogan or a single idea to become a suffragist. He may not even know there are two sides to the subject—and it is an object with suffragists to prevent his learning that there *are* two sides. We have to give *both* sides; study both sides; know both sides.

Even men high up in public life often show the want of accurate information on this subject. Some of the most brilliant "reasons" they give are a century out of date. Others never were real reasons.

They believe women have an "inherent right" to vote—when nobody has such a right to vote. They believe women should vote because they pay taxes, without knowing that Thomas Jefferson and Richard Henry Lee disposed of this argument before 1800!

They believe that woman suffrage would improve conditions—without ever taking the trouble to compare conditions with and without woman suffrage.

Therefore, our task is difficult, and the suffragists try to make it more difficult by questioning our motives and suppressing our material wherever they can. That we have been able to win twelve great State victories under these circumstances should make every anti-suffragist feel proud of the achievements as well as the fundamental ideals of the organized opposition to woman suffrage.

OUR CONVICTIONS

THE constant recurrence of the argument in favor of woman suffrage that women are equal in intelligence and education to man quite often gives persons unfamiliar with anti-suffrage doctrines the impression that we question these facts.

The contrary is true. No woman's anti-suffrage association, so far as we can discover, has ever officially issued a single sentence in which the dignity, power, status, intelligence or importance of woman is regarded as secondary, subservient or inferior to that of man.

It is because we believe so much in woman as woman that we object to woman as man.

We believe in woman's rights—not man's rights—for woman. And we believe that woman's rights are best conserved where we use woman's ways—and not man's—of obtaining and protecting them.

We believe that woman as a disinterested non-partisan, out of politics, exercises her greatest power and renders her most efficient service to the State, just as the Red Cross nurse, as a non-combatant, is in a position to serve and soothe warring humanity to the best advantage.

We believe that woman's non-partisanship is worth all our efforts to preserve it—especially when every available fact we can gather proclaims that the country's greatest need is united Americanism, and that it would be a great misfortune, either to divide up women in warring groups and factions, or to divide the interests of man and woman in good government by a "woman's party" to oppose the opposite sex.

We believe in woman's work. We believe in every effort tending to elevate woman's work and to make it more efficient.

Consequently, we believe in *concentration* on woman's work as the specialty which women must study to make it a success, just as every person of common sense knows that one must concentrate and specialize to achieve the best results in any occupation, profession or ideal.

We know what the average woman is doing as mother, teacher or guide of every citizen during the character-forming period. We know that there is nothing in man's politics which is worth the sacrifice of woman's greatest opportunities out of politics.

We believe that woman can do man's work—nearly anywhere. But we know that man cannot do woman's work, and since there is only one sex capable of doing woman's work, it would be a burdensome folly for that sex to take up man's politics either in addition to or instead of woman's distinctive duties.

OUR STANDARDS

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST always appreciates contributions and letters from its readers. Some of the contributions, however, though of an excellent literary style and clever in thought and expression, we are forced to reject because they do not conform to our standards.

This happens in every newspaper and magazine office. In most cases, the writer is left in the dark as to why his contribution was "not available." But since there is much need of good, constructive anti-suffrage material, and there are so many whose observations, training and studies have enabled them to acquire interesting views or data on this subject, we print the following general standards by which our editorial department judges all articles:

1. A new point of view.
2. The exaltation of womanhood—ideas tending to inspire women with consciousness of the power, dignity and opportunity in woman's work as woman.
3. The absence of critical, pessimistic or depreciatory statements concerning women in general or reflecting on all women.
4. The avoidance of all quotations and opinions intimating or suggesting a secondary or subservient status for women.
5. Absolute accuracy in statements of fact.
6. Sticking to the subject—woman suffrage—to the exclusion of other topics not directly related to the campaign for or against votes-for-women.
7. Breadth of discussion—dealing with great currents of vital interest to the *average woman*, and the omission of what is personal, trivial or far-fetched unless qualities of humor or the exigencies of a campaign justify the occasional use of such material.

There are times when we compromise on the extent to which the standards in paragraphs 6 and 7 apply to a contribution. On the other standards, we cannot compromise.

Anti-Suffrage—For Patriotism and Preparedness

THE PARADE PASSING UNDER THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE BANNER

THE FIRST AID STATION AT FOURTEENTH STREET AND FIFTH AVENUE

ONE of the most attractive and unique features of the Preparedness Parade on May 13th was the First Aid Station opened by the anti-suffragists at Broadway and Fourteenth Street, on the line of march.

The woman's anti-suffrage organizations came out officially for Preparedness early in the year, but not even for that would they consent, as an organization, to take part in a street parade.

Members who completed courses in Red Cross home nursing, first aid and emergency work last winter under the National Special Aid were in charge of the station.

These duly accredited nurses in cap and apron, with Dr. Josephine Walter and a staff of amateur assistants, remained on duty all day at the station, a large store fitted up with special aid equipment, in which was also located a recruiting station conducted by members of the New York National Guard and Coast Defense commands.

The object of the First Aid was to be of assistance to tired mothers on the sidewalk with sleepy children as well as to marchers falling out of line.

Among the women of the organization serving in shifts of morning, afternoon and evening, were Mrs. Robert Olyphant, Mrs. H. H. Story, Mrs. W. H. Smith, Mrs. Stanley Vietz, Mrs. George H. Dobbin, Miss Kreitler, Mrs. C. C. Overton, Mrs. Alfred Seton Post, Mrs. DeWitt Clinton Falls, Mrs. C. H. Halcomb, Mrs. Walter Lambert, Mrs. Alice Foote MacDougall, the Misses Henry, the Misses Tobias, Mrs. M. R. Livingston, Mrs. E. S. Kaufmann, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, and Mrs. George Phillips and staff of eight from Brooklyn.

More than 15,000 cups of milk, coffee, lemonade and water, with sandwiches of all kinds, were distributed to the marchers.

An injured motorcyclist was cared for until he could be removed to a hospital, several women suffering from heat or exhaustion were relieved, and surgical attention was given to a dog with a broken leg, which, as a window demonstration, attracted a large crowd.

In addition, many a tired mother came to the station and reclined on an army cot while her child was being fed by the nurses.

In the two big windows facing the street, a score of women sat all day demonstrating how to prepare, sterilize and put on first aid bandages.

When the station was first opened, several brief quotations from Elihu Root and Cardinal Gibbons were exhibited in the windows, but suffragists and socialists, massing outside, assumed so threatening an attitude that the signs were removed to save the windows.

A young college woman who strenuously objected to both anti-suffrage and preparedness, came into the station and demanded to know who was in charge. Upon being told, she said:

"You ought to be shot—and I would like to do the shooting."

From this it would appear that there are militant pacifists who are not so much opposed to the use of arms as to the organized and orderly use of arms for National defense only.

Outside the station and along the entire line of march, socialists, men and women, were circulating various radical newspapers and peace-at-any-price circulars.

One of these contained the following sentiments:

"Women!
Your Power to End War
Women defend your homes!
Get the VOTE! And vote against armaments.
Refuse to let your men-folk enlist.
Try the new way. The old way of swords and cannon has never worked. Away with armies and navies and guns and bayonets and bloody trenches and military 'obedience.'
Don't let your boys enlist."

If these circulars had any effect, it must have been of the reverse order, as eighty-five men came into the station and enlisted in the National Guard, and several hundred others obtained information and advice prior to enlistment.

WOMAN'S PART IN PREPAREDNESS

(From the Boston, Mass., *American*)

AS an apt expression of the attitude of anti-suffragists and other thinking women towards Preparedness, we cannot find better material than the following by Miss Anne Morgan, in the Boston *American:*

"The woman who in time of war saves the dollar in the homes saves the nation in the field."

With this statement Miss Anne Morgan, daughter of the greatest financial genius of his time, began her reply to the question:

"What will be the mission of the American woman in case of a war with any Power?"

THE DUTY OF WOMEN

"I do not think," said Miss Morgan, "that it is necessary for women to march in parades. But the American mother must discipline her boy in the home until he is fourteen years of age and then see that he is given military training."

She continues:

There will be no women with rifles in the field. There will be small use for women with shovels to dig trenches. Even in the nursing department the actual field work of the hospital is done by men. In an army such as ours the great bulk of its supplies are manufactured in large quantities and supplied by contract. The woman no longer makes the shirts and shoes and socks with her own hands. She is part of a new and wonderful governmental machine, having just as important and vital a task as the man in the field.

Once upon a time when the man went to war the woman remained home and wept. Now she must remain at home and do her part of the work. It deals with the economy of the home—with the bread and meat question. It deals with the keeping in circulation of the life blood of a country so that the fighting body may not suffer with congestion.

There are 20,000,000 women in the United States who will be a part of the national forces in case of war. They command the homes. Few of them, I believe, realize the important rôle they are to play.

The lesson of the European War has shown so plainly just what this course must be. In absolute governments like Russia, Turkey and Germany, where authority is vested in an imperial centre the governments have put into force laws for the supply of food, for taking care of the bread and meat and for so equalizing the outgo that want and the chances of want will be reduced to the minimum.

Did it ever occur to our women that we have no such governmental authority and no such means of enforcing it as have these absolute countries?

WEALTHY PAY FIRST

We have not. It then becomes the business of every woman in America to become a temporary Czar, Sultan or Kaiser in her own little empire, to know what expenses must be cut and how to cut them, and to take the active administration of home economies just as though a general law had placed them in effect and a paternal government stood at her elbow to enforce it.

And the study and practice of this economy is as much necessary with the woman of millions as with the woman who lives in a cottage. The more one has in war the larger the tax for the maintenance of war. It is upon the wealthy that the first drain of war expense falls. All false pretense, all living for appearances and making display beyond one's means must be automatically cut to meet a war situation.

It is going to take brains and study. The woman abroad has found herself with even the supply of necessities reduced. In Germany and Austria bread has been limited. In England a request that meat be cut off once a week and that luxuries be curtailed has been made. But in a democracy like England, which is like our own in many respects, the saving of the nation economically is a volunteer matter, and the individual woman is, in the last analysis, the power behind the salvation of the country.

In modern war it takes every dollar that a country can raise to pay the expenses. This money does not grow on trees. The people must provide it. Every dollar that goes into munition and the pay of an army comes out of something else.

If one will trace the dollars that form the basic power of a nation in arms, they will be found separating in millions of little streams, each one of which goes to a home. In each home there is usually the hand of a woman guiding the economic features of the household. She must squeeze the glory out of her weekly allowance, and it is her tribute that makes largely for success.

This is one of the new conditions made by modern war. It is made by the tremendous increase in expense, and the remarkable extension of a war condition so that no part of a national whole escapes its share of the burden.

WOMEN'S NEW DUTIES

Women must learn how to make gradual and wise economies. To suddenly take the revenue from one line of trade would mean injustice and ruin to that line. Madame Conservator of the Purse must not only seek to protect her own household, but she must remember that she is her sister's keeper and that her sister is the entire community.

There will be, of course, women who will nurse the sick. Women will play various parts in any war, but the great mass of the women of America will not be called upon to leave their homes and firesides. They will have to do no marching, no camping, no handling of weapons. The percentage of them who will actually work in industrial plants making ammunition and clothing will be small relatively. The backbone of the army of women will be in the homes, and there will be the real foundation for the nation's success.

Woman's part is big, it is dignified and it is important. It is womanly, and there is no question but that the American woman will meet with intelligence the situation, whatever it may be, if war should come to our land.

WHAT WOMEN WILL DO IN WAR AND AFTER WAR

THE publicity that has been given to the fact that many women are doing the work of men in the European countries at war has often been used as an argument in favor of woman suffrage.

Why it is so employed is one of the puzzles of suffrage reasoning with which we do not pretend to be familiar, since the anti-suffrage doctrine is not that woman cannot do man's work, but that man cannot do hers and she cannot do *both*. Every lesson of the war has borne out this truth.

It is interesting, in this connection, to quote authorities actually on the ground of the great conflict.

Dr. Arabella Kenealy, in the London *Daily Mail*, recently said:

"By force of brain or will we may increase our physical and mental output—but only at the cost of constitution. And that is what our girls and women have been doing for some generations, and what in their admirable efforts to take men's places they are doing still more now. And the consequences? The consequences are disastrous to the children. Because the mothers, in overdrawing on their constitutional reserves to enable them to do men's work, exhaust the constitutional resources of the generations to come."

She contends that "when women are trained to compete physically, professionally and industrially with men, the natural investment in them of vital power for racial purposes is prevented and the race suffers proportionately."

The *Anti-Suffrage Review*, of London, published by the National League For Opposing Woman Suffrage, which is headed by Earl Curzon and includes many of the best known women of England, among them Mrs. Humphry Ward, says:

"Anyone acquainted with women's work in the past, covering as it did in a wide range both chain making at Cradley Heath and the more arduous work of carrying children, will know that there are few tasks beyond the muscular strength of some women. What they will not know is the extent to which machinery has lightened the work of making heavy shells.

"It is no new thing, then, for women to be in occupations; what is new is the sudden increase in the numbers employed.

EQUAL PAY BUT UNEQUAL WORK

"Proud as the country is of the way in which women have played their part in war time, there are abundant reasons why the abnormal conditions should come to an end as soon as possible. In the meantime care should be taken that women's work should not be exploited, either for the benefit of employers or for propaganda purposes, and that the dangers to which they are exposed should be reduced to a minimum. Equal pay for equal work by all means, but the great demand should be that they must never do equal work."

Dr. Kenealy insists upon this point.

"In all cases where women do men's work less work should be expected of them. They should be allowed longer intervals for rest, and where possible should sit instead of stand."

The *Review* continues:

"No doubt in war time, counsels of perfection must go by the board, for every willing worker must be utilized. But the warning of the medical profession may be borne in mind with a view to regulating conditions after the war. It is no use for the country to congratulate itself on its forethought in providing shop assistants with seats, if it is going to sanction the employment of women for long hours as tram and omnibus conductors and ticket collectors, under conditions in which it is impossible for them to sit down. But the first desideratum is that there should be no tacit acceptance of the theory that it is a good thing for women to do men's work, or that there will be the same need for them to do it after the war. There will naturally be some increase of women workers, but as far as possible provision should be made for their employment only in healthy work.

AFTER THE WAR

"Under normal conditions it is established by census statistics that nearly 50 per cent. of the women at work between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five years have dropped out of employment by the time they reach the age of thirty. The influences which prompted the abandonment of work before will probably be found to be operating in regard to the number of war-workers. While some will cease work at the end of the war, others will drop out gradually, as they did under pre-war conditions, but with this difference, that the circumstances which led to the increase in the number of women workers during the war will then no longer obtain. In other words, their places will not be taken by younger women. When these two classes of women are eliminated, and allowance is made for the number of posts which must terminate with the end of the war, the residue will indicate the extent to which the war has been responsible for the revolution in the employment of women. How great this residue is can at this stage only be a matter of speculation. We may, however, beware of exaggeration.

"By last October the increase in the number of women employed in industrial occupations was officially stated to amount to about 6 per cent. of the more than four million women in occupations before the war, or nearly 150,000. These figures have since been augmented, but even so they will hardly constitute a revolution in the country's industry.

"The official statement, given in reply to a question in the House of Commons, that of the 1,900,000 persons engaged on Government work in the metal and chemical trades, including those employed at the ordnance factories, only little more than 200,000 are women and girls, will come as a surprise to many.

"Yet in a leading article in its issue of March 30th, *The Guardian* wrote:

"'We learn that there are in this country at present over 3,800 munition centers. The women workers probably number millions.'"

"This statement well illustrates the very loose thinking which is characteristic of so many of the references to women's work and should serve as a warning to those who are inclined to draw conclusions from inaccurate premises. The response of women to the nation's need has been magnificent, but no good purpose will be served by distorting the fact as an argument for a political doctrine. That the number of women munition workers has increased from 50,000 in October, 1915, to 200,000 in April, 1916, shows how readily they have been coming forward to help. But neither the 200,000 in munition work nor the others doing other kinds of war work necessarily constitute a revolution for all time in the industrial world. That there will be an increase in the number of women in industry after the war is certain; but it is not necessary for that reason to infer, as some speakers and publicists infer, that crèches and communal kitchens must at once become general, because all mothers will be working in or wanted for factories."

NO DANGER OF POLYGAMY

Nor are some other theories more tenable, such as the one that women will so vastly outnumber men in the populations of the warring countries as to demand some adjustment of monogamous marriage.

Even Mr. H. G. Wells, in a notable article on "The Woman and The War" in the current issue of the *Ladies Home Journal*, says:

"Various writers, brooding over the coming shortage of men, have jumped to the conclusion that polygamy is among the probabilities of the near future. They write in terms of real or affected alarm for which there is no justification; they wallow in visions of Germany 'legalizing' polygamy and see Berlin seeking recuperation in man power by converting herself into another Salt Lake City.

"But I do not see any great possibility of an especially rich class, capable of maintaining numerous wives, being sustained by the impoverished and indebted world of Europe, nor the sources from which the supply of women preferring to become constituents in a polygamous constellation rather than self-supporting freewomen is to be derived. The temperamental dislike of intelligent women to polygamy is at least as strong as man's objection to polyandry. Polygamy, open or hidden, flourishes widely only where there are women to be bought. Moreover, there are considerable obstacles in religion and custom to be overcome by the innovating polygamist."

WHY MR. WELLS IS WRONG

Nevertheless, Mr. Wells himself is misled in his interpretion of the effect of the war on women because of his well known socialist and feminist views.

He believes that after the war, women must have won the vote, because in the service to their country during the war "they have won it."

He assumes, like all other socialists and feminists, that women are the subject sex. He quotes the discredited and disputed attack on women called "The World's Worst Failure" as "virile common sense"—after *women* like Ida M. Tarbell and Marion Harland have shown its absurdities.

He believes that there is a constant "debate" between the sexes, which has gone on since "we were still in the trees."

"Man and woman in that duet," he says, "struggle perpetually for the upper hand, and the man restrains the woman and the woman resents the man."

From this, it is easily seen why he draws his conclusion that the war is "bringing us rapidly to a state of affairs in which women will be much more definitely independent of their sexual status, much less hampered in their self development, and much more nearly equal to men, than has ever been known before in the whole history of mankind."

Mr. Wells is wrong, because his initial premise is wrong. Like all feminists, he believes in woman's inferiority, in woman's lack of development, but hopes the war will make her "more equal" to his own superior sex!

He puts "self-supporting and self-respecting" together as though the woman working as wife and mother is not worth all and more than any man can ever do for her in return.

He seems to believe that women have "won" something by making munitions that they have never deserved by making homes and happiness!

He bases his prophesy on a belief that by going into war-work, women have become possessed of a weapon which man will not be able to resist in his weakened condition after the war.

He does not even stop to think that the overwhelming majority of women neither want nor need any additional weapon with which to vanquish man than they have always possessed and exercised.

If women wanted to become as men, they need not have waited for the war, and tried, as it were, to gain their liberty while man was "down" and bleeding from his numerous wounds.

There has never been a time in the history of the world when the mother of the race could not train her sons to regard her sex and its status in any way she desires.

In every "debate" since "we were still in the trees" woman has had the last word.

Woman is not the subject sex, nor will she ever become the subject sex unless we return to savagery and she "earns her own living" at hard labor just as man does, and is asked in addition to do all the duties of a woman without which the race would perish.

Such a state of affairs is not likely to occur unless woman herself makes that choice.

THE CENSUS SHOWS HER CHOICE

The feminists constantly imagine that woman *have* made the choice of so-called "freedom" and have merely been waiting for the machinery of war, industry and politics as a means for their "emancipation."

There are figures to prove otherwise, and as Miss Tarbell says, "it is difficult to dispute the census."

Suffragists and feminists believe—on the basis of their own hopes, perhaps—that one taste of the "freedom" of punching a time clock four times a day and tending a machine sixty hours a week makes a woman want to be "self-supporting and self-respecting" the rest of her life. The average woman in industry has no such illusion nor inclination—and yet there is no power under Heaven but her own will to prevent her following it.

In the United States the average woman in gainful occupations is there from three to seven years.

Between the ages of sixteen to twenty, nearly 40 per cent. of our girls are gainfully occupied. Between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five, the proportion drops to 26 per cent., and after the age of forty-five to 15 per cent. This variation and decrease in the proportion of women in industrial life proves that their "freedom" is voluntarily given up. For what? Marriage—the profession and career of eight women in every ten.

This deliberate choice would seem to indicate that there is something lacking in the appeal of "economic independence" to the average woman, and that the sort of freedom she really wants she seeks at the fireside, with a husband and children!

The figures also indicate that it is grim necessity, and not choice, which makes the average woman remain in industry, and that she leaves it as soon as she can for marriage—obviously to better her condition, as we must admit that these women make an intelligent choice.

But with the men, the story in figures is different. Between the ages of sixteen and twenty, 79 per cent. of our boys are gainfully occupied; from the ages of twenty-one to forty-five, nearly 97 per cent. of our men are thus engaged, and the proportion only drops to 86 per cent. after the age of forty-five, showing a remarkable contrast to the feminine figures.

WEALTH AND THE WOMAN

War may make a difference in the normal distinction between man's and woman's work—but only to the extent to which the necessity and the poverty of a people force women to remain in industry against their will and their normal aspirations.

So long as motherhood and fatherhood are different functions, requiring different duties and different lengths of time for their fulfillment, and so long as humanity is not poverty stricken to the point where it must make the mother "work above her force and sex," we will have this division of the sexes in the work of the world.

Every calamity of war or poverty, every misguided movement like feminism which seeks to break down this difference and force man's work on the woman, must react to the disadvantage of the child and the race.

But the universal accumulation of wealth despite the ravages of war, and the woman's *own choice* of her work, will ultimately triumph over the *pessimism*, the *feminism* and the *necessity* of a temporary re-adjustment in the progress of civilization.

J. S. E.

WHY SUFFRAGE WAS DEFEATED IN MASSACHUSETTS

By Professor Ernest Bernbaum, of Harvard

[Editor's Note—The following article is an *extract* from Professor Bernbaum's Introduction to "Anti-Suffrage Essays By Massachusetts Women," a new book issued by The Forum Publications, of Boston, which contains, perhaps, the best symposium of the views of the woman in business, in industry, in war, in social work, in reform, in the school and the home that has yet been attempted on this subject. Among the contributors are Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. A. J. George, Mrs. Henry Preston White, and fourteen other prominent Massachusetts women.]

FOR at least two generations suffragists have been spending a huge amount of energy and money in spreading their doctrine. Contributions, mainly drawn from a few rich women, have enabled them to send professional speakers into every district of the State, to distribute tons of "literature" to supply the press with a constant stream of "news" written from their point of view, and in general to advertise their claims in the most lavish way. A propaganda so subsidized would have been successful decades ago if sound principles and common sense were on its side. But to their consternation the suffragists found that the vast majority of Massachusetts women turned a deaf ear to their plausible appeals, and that their strongest opponents were those of their own sex.

Suffragists continued to talk about what "we women" want. But men presently began to see that these women had no right to pretend to represent their sex. Even their own claims as to the number of women supporting them showed that they represented only between 5 per cent. and 10 per cent of the women of Massachusetts. At least 90 per cent. of the women—either by open opposition, or by a marked indifference to the subject—showed that no general statement could be more emphatically true than that Massachusetts women did not want to vote.

When this truth was insistently pressed upon the suffragists, they were apt to call the indifferent women "unenlightened." This was felt to be an insult rather than an explanation. The average Massachusetts man does not think of his mother, wife and sister as "unenlightened"—certainly not on the suffrage question. She has heard and read the suffrage notions again and again. He knows that if she felt that man was her oppressor, or that the welfare of herself or her family would be increased by her enfranchisement, she would say so. She is a sensible, observant woman, who knows what she wants, does not hesitate to ask for it, and usually gets it. But she was not asking for the ballot. It did not take her long to see through the suffrage fallacy that "only those women would need to vote who want it." She realized that the vote would mean an obligation as well as a privilege, and that she could not honorably accept the privilege without undertaking the obligation. Her life being already crowded with duties that only she could discharge, she would not add to them one that her husband, brother or son can discharge at least as well.

* * * * *

The nature of that responsibility brings us to what seems to me the second important cause for the suffrage defeat. Men—more than politically inexperienced women—know that good government depends upon the willingness of the electorate to do its duty vigilantly and regularly. The greatest good to the greatest number of classes (including women and children in each class) can be secured only when a large proportion of the eligible voters vote. Those voters who are led by bosses, or by selfish interests, go to the polls steadily. Their influence can be offset only when the rest of the electorate goes likewise.

The results of elections in which a small proportion of the eligible voters take part, are poor laws and incompetent or corrupt government.

The leading political issues—the tariff, trusts, transportation, military and police force, taxation, finance, etc.—bear directly upon the work of men in their trades and business, and under male suffrage a fairly large proportion of the vote is cast. The life-work of women removes them from the contact with these political questions and the nature of most women is not attracted by the contentious spirit in which political warfare is conducted. As long as no more than 10 per cent. of the women took an interest in the woman suffrage question itself, no man could reasonably expect them to be otherwise than indifferent to the regular subjects of political conflict. To impose political duties upon the sex against its will was simply to create conditions that encouraged corrupt and feeble government. The soundness of this principle was, furthermore, being demonstrated in woman-suffrage territory, such cities as Seattle and such States as Colorado showing that sooner or later a neglectful electorate leads to the downfall of good government.

* * * * *

The third cause for the defeat of woman suffrage was the disgust which the manners, methods and unethical sentiments of the suffragists aroused. This is not pleasant to dwell upon, but was too important an influence in the campaign to leave unmentioned. The suffragists professed to "occupy higher moral ground," to uplift politics, and to elevate womanhood. The longer one observed their deeds and words, the surer one became that they were not uplifting politics and that they tended to disgrace women in men's eyes. The tone of politics can be improved if the contestants will avoid false assertions and unnecessary personal attacks. The suffragists said and did things which were, like militancy, excusable only on the immoral ground that the end justifies the means.

As an example of their disingenous statements, the following may serve: The National Woman Suffrage Association circulated a flyer entitled "Twenty Facts About Woman Suffrage." "Fact No. 15," under the heading "How Women Vote," read: "Arizona, California, Colorado and Washington are the only States which have eight-hour laws for working women."

Any unsuspecting reader would infer just what he was intended to infer—namely, that it was woman suffrage that brought about all these eight-hour laws, and that male suffrage had not brought about any of them.

A more truthful heading for this "fact" would have been "How Men Vote."

The credit for passing the eight-hour law in California and in Washington (also in Arizona so far as laundry workers are concerned) belongs to legislatures elected by men alone. False suggestions of this type no doubt gained many proselytes in parlor meetings; but when they were made in the open forum of a public campaign, their untruth was exposed, and the voters grew indignant that women should thus have tried to mislead them. The suffragists only made a bad matter worse by alleging that their anti-suffrage sisters were given to misrepresentations and to every other crime in the political calendar; for men thereupon concluded that if this initial participation in politics had such demoralizing effects on the women of each side, it was best to keep both parties out of the arena altogether.

SOME FACTS A SENATOR SHOULD STUDY

By Mrs. J. Alex. Mahon

IN a speech delivered in the United States Senate, by Senator Shafroth, of Colorado, on April 25, 1916, are some very startling, extraordinary and unfair assertions and comparisons. The Senator makes the statement that "half the property of the United States is taxed without representation."

If the Senator would examine the tax books of the several States he would find that on the average, not over one-eighth of the taxes levied are paid by women, and that the personal and real property upon which taxes are levied is assessed in seven out of every eight cases in the name of men, notwithstanding the fact that many thousands of men in the country prefer to have the property they have earned taxed in the names of their wives for prudential reasons. So if women had the ballot, the women who pay taxes upon property held in their own names would not be treated so fairly and justly as they now are, for with women voting, about seven-eighths of the women who would be entitled to vote on questions involving taxation, would pay no taxes, while with men voting, as at present, in the male suffrage States, seven-eighths of these male voters are taxpayers, and they pay approximately seven-eighths of all the taxes. No injustice is possible where the men voting the taxes pay the greater part of the amount. Men always have, and always will, produce the greater part of the wealth, and always have, and always will, pay the greater part of the taxes. Statistics show that in those few States that have enjoyed woman suffrage the longest there has been no increase in the *number* of women taxpayers over the number who paid taxes before suffrage was granted, other than such increase as naturally comes from the increase in population.

Senator Shafroth says: "The money raised by taxation for school purposes in Colorado is greater in amount, considering population, than that raised in any other State of the Union." The Bulletin of 1912 of the United States Census Report (the latest published report) shows other States in which a larger amount of money was raised by taxation for school purposes in proportion to the population than was raised in Colorado.

The statement is made by the Senator that, "The women in those (equal suffrage) States in proportion to their numbers cast about as many votes as do the men." Instead of making a fair and reasonable comparison, by taking the number of men and women of voting age in the equal suffrage States, finding by the election returns how many of them voted, and then ascertaining the number of men in the adjoining and neighboring male-suffrage States where the laws concerning voting are similar except as to sex, and then computing the per cent. of men who exercised the franchise, the Senator, by some unknown process of reasoning, prefers to take into consideration the entire population, men, women and children, of the two States of Washington and Connecticut—States 3,000 miles apart—and makes a comparison of the number who voted in 1914. Connecticut contains a smaller percentage of population of voting age, and a larger percentage of aliens than there are in the State of Washington, but the Senator endeavors to bolster up his assertion that women in equal suffrage States vote in proportion to their numbers about the same as the men. Had he taken the population of the State of Washington of voting age; deducted the number of aliens, and the citizenship not reported, he would have found that only about 56 per cent. of the men and women in that State, who were entitled to vote in 1914, cast their ballots at the election that year, while with the men of voting age in Connecticut, omitting the aliens, and the citizenship not reported, he would have found that approximately 68 per cent. voted in 1914.

AN UNFAIR COMPARISON.

Senator Shafroth also made the unfair comparison between the States of Kansas and Oklahoma. The latter State, with its "grandfather's clause," and other laws discouraging certain classes of voters from using the ballot, is not a State that can fairly and honestly be compared with Kansas, where there is no "grandfather's clause," or other legislation such as exists in Oklahoma, nor is the percentage of illiteracy in Kansas to be compared to that reported by the census statistics as existing in Oklahoma. Taking the Senator's own figures of the vote in Denver, Colo., in 1912, where the male and female population is about equal (107,395 males, and 105,986 females), the number of men who voted in that election was 34,632, and the number of females who voted was 25,315, thus showing that about 58 per cent. of the vote cast was voted by men, while only about 42 per cent. of the vote cast was voted by women.

Did Senator Shafroth forget, or intentionally omit, the vote cast at the Chicago, Ill., election, last month? In Illinois the votes cast by men and by women are kept separate, and while the number of men and women in the city of Chicago who are entitled to register and vote are about equal (there being more alien men than alien women in that city), about three times as many men voted in April, 1916, at the city election, as did women. The women's vote declined more than 100,000 over the figure cast by them at the city election of the year previous.

SENATORS SHOULD BE ACCURATE.

If the Senator desired the facts about women voting less generally than the men when they are given the ballot he should have compared the vote of the six suffrage States where women had the right to vote for President in 1912, with the six adjoining and neighboring States which were male-suffrage States at that time—Oregon, Nevada, Nebraska, South Dakota, Kansas and Missouri—(the first two having since adopted woman suffrage), he would have found that only about 45 per cent. of the men and women of voting age voted for President that year, in the woman-suffrage States, while about 69 per cent. of the men voted in the then six male-suffrage States above enumerated.

It is to be expected that emotional and over-zealous women in the excess of zeal will make extraordinary statements and unfair comparisons, as such conduct has been unvarying with the women propagandists when engaged in urging votes for women, but it is expected that a United States Senator will make fair comparisons, employ accurate figures, and make logical deductions, when asking support for woman suffrage.

It is a fact, which cannot be successfully disproved that women never have, in any election in a woman suffrage State, voted as generally as men when they have been given the ballot. It is a certainty that they never will do so, because of their duty of motherhood, and also because of the fact that nowhere in this country, or the world for that matter, can there be found a majority of women who want the ballot. It stands to reason that when the majority of women are actively opposed or indifferent to women suffrage, it cannot hope to equal the number of votes cast by men.

Feminists write and talk of "the subjection of woman"—because a man—to save his face—wove those words together eighty years ago—and his followers have learned nothing since.

Yet all these years woman has *demonstrated* "the subjection of man"—while few dare even to show him sympathy.

No matter what her service is worth, she has forced man to guarantee in his laws that he will support her as his wife and maintain her and her child if he casts her off—yet she has not even allowed him to dream of making a law requiring *her* to render any service whatsoever to *him* or the *race* in exchange for her maintenance.

A "MESSAGE FROM WESTERN WOMEN VOTERS"

THE advantage of reporting a suffrage meeting in advance in the past tense may compensate for lack of accurate details in the opinion of suffragists.

This is the only explanation that occurs to one who reads in a suffrage organ for June that the Message of Western Women Voters at Carnegie Hall on May 28th "was a magnificent meeting, and an inspiring opening of our new campaign."

"The words spoken by Dr. Shaw and Mrs. Catt added to the force of the message and the enthusiasm it aroused."

No doubt Dr. Shaw should have spoken and "added to the force" of the message. But she didn't, although this addition was badly needed.

"The message given by our western sisters in brief speeches was varied, often marked with humor, always full of suggestion, and invariably prophetic of victory in New York," the suffrage organ says.

We are giving a few of the "variations" and the things that were "marked with humor"—reported *after* the meeting, which is somewhat slower than the suffrage method, but which *also* has its compensations.

There were fifteen speeches by representative club-women from the eleven suffrage States, Illinois and Alaska.

An amusing feature of the meeting was the demonstration that though women of the West now have "a voice in government" said to be "equal" to that of man, they suffer the lack of a masculine voice in a big hall.

No one has ever doubted a woman's ability to talk, but even women voters, it develops, *cannot make themselves heard* by a large audience.

The suffragists had planned a mass-meeting for a great number of people. About 1,500 came, who were scattered throughout the hall.

Those in the balconies shouted "louder" to the speakers until it was discovered that their limit had been reached, after which fully a third of the audience in the back of the hall got up and walked out.

The speeches themselves were eulogies and flourishes, rather than messages or arguments. The sunshine of California, the red apples of Oregon, the gold of Alaska or the greatness of Kansas seemed to contribute the chief topics of each speaker's address.

"Woman suffrage has been a success in Colorado," said one woman. "There are many reasons why it has been a success, which it would take me too long to tell you. But look at me and see if I am a truthful person. Do I look like a truthful person? I tell you that yes, it has been a success."

Another woman said that Colorado had been "slandered" by the antis, which Denver business men had denied. All the troubles of Colorado, she believed, were because of the "men of the East who exploit humanity."

This is a sad state of affairs in Colorado, certainly. "Men of the East" without votes in Colorado, are able to "exploit humanity" there by "indirect influence" in spite of women's votes, and the fact that the Federation of Women's Clubs "is called the third House in Colorado" and "can pass practically any legislation it wants" there!

This woman speaker declared that she had written "the most babylike letters to legislators" but "because they represented women and not votes," no attention was paid. This is interesting, to say the least. Why should one write "babylike" letters to represent women? And might not their failure to attract attention be because they were "babylike?"

There is "no other State superior" to Colorado—because a woman says so who insists that she "looks truthful."

The other parts of the "message" were just as instructive.

One woman succeeded in contradicting herself in two sentences without even knowing it. In Oregon, "suffrage has not affected our homes in any way. It has made us better mothers." Naturally, "better mothers" do not "affect our homes in any way!"

When California obtained woman suffrage, in 1911, according to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, who presided, "people began to sit up and take notice." "Before that, they regarded the suffrage States as only the wild and woolly West," she added.

Of course, who doubts it? And since the people "sat up and took notice," votes-for-women have been defeated in fourteen State campaigns at the polls, in four of which the antis polled a larger majority than the combined pluralities of all the suffrage States!

It pays "to take notice."

One of the speakers seemed to regard it as a compliment to her cause that some man had asked her: "Are you a suffragist? You don't look like one." And she didn't. That is how they got the vote in Arizona—by not looking like suffragists—so the men could notice it!

In Nevada, "conditions favored the enfrancisement of women." In its vast territory, with 220 men to 100 women, "men just lived under their hats." Anything with the name "woman" attached to it, which suggested "home and mother" was grasped at eagerly. Not only that, but when a few men left the State on business or pleasure there were not enough left behind to hold an election. In some cases, we were told, the State "had to call men home from Canada, Alaska and South Africa" to do the voting. Under the circumstances, Nevada will probably have to be excused. When it grows up into a great State, with as many inhabitants as a first class city, and the men begin to *think* instead of "live under their hats," they will probably repeal woman suffrage, and forget the wild days of votes-for-women.

An interesting feature was the use of the words "fellow citizens" as a form of address that is customary in the suffrage States, but seems to need a substitute in suffrage speeches here. Why? It was in 1868 that "every person born or naturalized in the United States" was defined as a citizen by the Federal Constitution—yet some of the suffragists seem not to have discovered it yet.

"In my State I would say 'fellow citizens'," was repeated frequently with variations. It would be enlightening to discover whether suffragists believe women and children are included in the numerous notes our Government writes about "protecting the rights of American citizens."

In Illinois the suffragists are truly grateful "that we did not lose what we have."

The "women are not happy over the present mayor" in Chicago. They are also "not responsible." Some 63 per cent. of the women voted for him at the election—but in the primaries the women alone would have nominated another man. Therefore, it is not their fault. The suffragists always have an excuse. They want the vote to get things the men refuse—but when the men show their power to refuse with the vote as well, it is the man's vote that is still at fault. "The woman's vote can do no wrong."

Mrs. Catt closed the meeting with an appeal to the women to attend the demonstration in Chicago. She says the suffragists "are trying to civilize some of our women."

She "mentioned no names," but as "suffrage first" is Mrs. Catt's hobby, and "charity begins at home," this looks like trouble for "some of our women" suffragists.

Also, Mrs. Catt implored women to "feel the disgrace of your inferiority."

Without the feeling of inferiority, the "cause" would be lost, no doubt, and the Belmont, Leslie and other millions would be "all dressed up with no place to go."

Throughout the suffrage agitation, from the earliest pleas to the latest feminist utterances, we find the belief that women are "inferior," "slaves," are "classed with idiots, criminals and paupers," etc.

One speaker from the West added "teamsters and bootblacks" to the list.

The entire suffrage philosophy is based on the idea that women must have the ballot to become "equal" to man.

That is probably the real reason why suffrage has made so few converts among women.

Every suffragist believes woman inferior to man. This alone is enough to disgust women with pride in their womanhood, and besides, the average woman's personal experiences convince her that it is not so. But when suffragists add to the assumption of woman's inferiority the additional presumption that this alleged—and mythical—inferiority could be removed by "a little piece of paper in the ballot box once or twice a year on the way to market" they not only depreciate the position, but insult the intelligence of women.

POISONED CHICKENS

AN issue of the suffrage journal says that "poisoned chickens show need of votes for women."

Disregarding the obvious silliness of this article, and the opportunity it furnishes for a pun, it is sufficient to remark that it exploits the over-feeding of chickens for market in New York—which is clearly prohibited by "man-made" law—as a suffrage argument!

In other words, the person who holds out the chief hope of success in enforcing the law—the housekeeper who buys the chickens—is told that she needs to use a ballot once or twice a year, instead of reminded that she needs to use her brains every time she purchases a chicken.

The Commissioner of Weights and Measures said that it would require 1,000 men to inspect the poultry coming into New York. Instead of telling housekeepers to use their heads and refuse to buy "poisoned chickens," the suffrage journal, for the benefit of its own propaganda, tells them to vote for a small army of inspectors to save them the trouble of thinking.

The whole affair suggests the need of thoughts for women, instead of votes for women, on why the consumer does not get what she pays for.

She gets what she demands. If she is willing to be cheated and to accept substitutes and inferior goods, rogues will always find a way to sell them to her in spite of the law. Instead of bothering about the ballot, the average housekeeper can more profitably study the ancient Roman maxim: "Let the buyer beware."

A NEW DOCTRINE

EVEN Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, the British militant, has revised her opinion of woman's work in war since she has seen her countrywomen actually adjusting themselves to war conditions. The following editorial, from the Memphis, Tenn., *Commercial Appeal*, would suggest that Mrs. Pankhurst has learned at least, that woman's work in war is distinctive. It is but an additional step in the return to common sense to adopt the anti-suffrage doctrine that woman's work is different in peace and in politics, as well as in war, from man's:

Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst has been a long time out of the public limelight—that is, a long time for Mrs. Emmeline, who at one time seemed to have taken up her abode in that precinct.

Now she emerges into it again, and the doctrine she is preaching is so new that it seems almost revolutionary by comparison with her former utterances. She is preaching military preparedness instead of "militant suffragettism." And the preparedness is to be for the women and to be compulsory.

But the queer thing is the kind of preparedness she is advocating. It is not for future window-smashing or picture-cutting or house-burning. These things are of the past, and the new effort of women is to be for military preparedness of a very anti-suffragette nature. No marching or drilling or service in the ranks is contemplated; these are still to be left to the men, while the women are to be trained to nurse, to cook, to sew, to keep clean surroundings, to do office and clerical work such as men have hitherto monopolized. The first of these things Mrs. Pankhurst thinks will be needed by the women who go with the Red Cross department of the army; the latter will come in for those who remain at home, for to them will fall the work laid down by the "soldiering" men.

It is astonishing enough to know that the virulent leader of the military suffragettes is advocating these things, and it is further calculated to make the world gasp when she explains, with evident satisfaction, that "these pursuits will not make for militaristic ideals of government, but will inspire democratic and domestic ideals."

The voice that a short time ago was shrieking for "votes for women" is now calling earnestly for cooking and cleaning and nursing lessons for them. It is a change of front for which nobody seems to have been prepared.

But it is a change that marks Mrs. Pankhurst as a most astute politician. The war is running on to a close, and when it is over the women who have stood by the government will have every right to demand something in return for their loyalty. One of the most patriotic demonstrations of this war was the way the English women, at the first note of national danger, put aside their fight for political recognition and rallied to the nation's aid. It was a fine thing, a very fine thing, done as it was so promptly and so unanimously, and when peace comes England will be recreant to the best traditions of her nationality if she does not in adequate measure make her acknowledgment. It may be she will give them the ballot; it may be she will hold to that but give them, instead, such laws of property and divorce and guardianship of their children as will be satisfactory protection for them.

And now Mrs. Pankhurst adds to this side of the question her new doctrine of such training for women as will lead more to home-making than window-breaking.

Verily, the suffragette world "do move," and this time in a new direction.

ANOTHER DEFEAT

REPRESENTATIVE MANN, of Illinois, on May 22d, while the attendance in the House of Representatives was slim, offered a resolution to add an amendment to the Porto Rican bill to grant woman suffrage to the island.

Mr. Mann's resolution was carried by sixty to thirty-seven votes.

Immediately, it was reported all over the country: "House Will Vote on Woman Suffrage," "Porto Rican Women to Get Votes," etc.

The New York *Tribune* called it "setting at naught all the careful maneuvering of the antis to avoid a vote on this issue before the November election."

On May 23d, the amendment offered by Mr. Mann came up and was defeated by eighty to fifty-nine votes.

Thus it is apparent that the suffrage strength in Congress—which Mr. Mann and other suffragists wanted tested—proved to be sixty votes. The suffragists need 294 votes to pass a Federal suffrage amendment!

In January, 1915, the suffragists had 174 votes in Congress. But that was before New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts "put the rage in suffrage."

Now, after a strenuous year of agitation, cross-country "envoying," "tormenting Congress," threats against the "party in power" and all others who do not believe in woman suffrage, the congressional vote has decreased to sixty—just when the "cause" most needed to show some strength to impress the political conventions.

THE STATE OPPOSITION TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

CONNECTICUT

THE calendar for the month of June is well filled with dates for meetings to be held in various towns and cities throughout the State.

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, of Hartford, the State President, has planned to attend many of the annual meetings of the local branches.

At all the recent meetings, and at all meetings to be held in the immediate future, there will be given reports of the work done in Iowa against woman suffrage. Connecticut contributed generously to the Iowa campaign.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AT the last monthly meeting, the District of Columbia Association adopted the following resolution:

"*Whereas,* The country is now facing issues of such transcendent importance as the effect of the World War, our troubles with Mexico, and our immediate need of Preparedness, it becomes a matter of Patriotism that minor questions of a disturbing nature be laid aside, and therefore:

"*Be It Resolved,* That we request the Committees on Platforms of the Republican and Democratic National Conventions convening at Chicago and St. Louis, to make no mention of Woman Suffrage."

The resolution was recommended to the National Association and passed by the Board of Directors on May 25th. It was sent to the delegates to the conventions with the following appeal added by the National president:

We trust that you will lend your influence to this end, so that our women may retain their present freedom from the maelstrom of politics, in accordance with the desire of the majority of both men and women, so that American women may continue to devote their splendid energies to the advancement of non-partisan and humanitarian enterprises without political bias; and that they may concentrate on the service of womanhood, childhood and the home through which they make their greatest contribution to the country and the common good.

GEORGIA

ON the second Thursday in May the Georgia Association held its annual meeting at the Hotel Demsey, Macon. Miss Caroline Patterson was re-elected President. This is her third term, but Mrs. Walter D. Lamar, one of the leaders of the anti-suffragists in Georgia, said that there could be found no dissenting voice in Miss Patterson's re-election.

An anniversary tea was held on the 30th, at which the association went on record for national preparedness.

Mrs. Lamar has arranged for a public debate with a leading suffragist, after a series of discussions in the newspapers which has lasted some weeks. Literature appealing to Southern sentiments has been circulated in the newspapers and otherwise, in Georgia and neighboring States, and especial success has been achieved in interesting college women in opposing suffrage.

MAINE

AT the annual meeting of the Maine Association opposed to suffrage for women, held on May 3d, officers were elected as follows: Honorary President, Mrs. S. W. Thaxter; President, Mrs. J. F. A. Merrill; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George E. Bird and Mrs. D. W. Snow; Secretary, Miss Alice Wood; Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand Wheeler; Registrar, Mrs. Frank W. Lamb; Auditor, Mrs. Harry B. Virgin; Chairman of Executive Committee, Mrs. F. T. Bradstreet Gardiner.

Augustus F. Moulton gave an address on "The Colonial Dame."

NEW JERSEY

COVERS for one hundred were laid at the "get-together" luncheon given by the Montclair Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage at the Montclair Hotel, May 13th. Pink tulips and apple and cherry blossoms formed the decorations. Mrs. Union Noble Bethell, President of the organization, was toast-mistress, and toasts were given by Mrs. Franklin H. Hooper, on "Constructive Organization," Mrs. Robert Hoe Dodd, "The Wage-earner's Problem," and Miss Caroline Stewart, "Need of Funds in Our Work." Miss Clara Vezin, of Elizabeth, gave a report of the State campaign carried on last year.

Following the luncheon a musical program was given by Mrs. John M. Goodell, Mrs. John C. Van Duyne, Mrs. William H. Peck and Mrs. Julius Geertz. Fancy dances were given by Miss Eleanor Halpin.

The committee in charge of the arrangements consisted of Mrs. Dallas Flanagan, Mrs. Godell, Mrs. Dodd, Mrs. George Lane Benedict, Mrs. Charles Whiting Baker, Mrs. Kent Costikyan, Mrs. H. L. Gantt, Mrs. Frank Boultbee, Mrs. Hooper, Miss Stewart, Mrs. Albert Comstock, Mrs. Bethell, Mrs. Percy Crane and Mrs. William S. Covell, as Chairman.

Letters of congratulation on the work of the association were received from Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, formerly Mrs. Grover Cleveland, and Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President of the National Organization.

TENNESSEE

THE Nashville Branch of the Tennessee Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage held a large and enthusiastic meeting at the home of Mrs. John J. Vertrees early in the month. It was decided that these meetings be in the nature of a woman's council, and subjects of vital interest to the cause of anti-suffrage be discussed. Leaders for the various meetings will be appointed later.

Some of the subjects selected were: "Feminism and Socialism," "Woman's Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform," "Taxation and Suffrage," "Suffrage Not a Natural Right," "What Suffrage Means to the Farmer," "Child Labor and Legislation," "The Wage-Earning Woman and the State," "Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage."

There was read with great interest an address that was delivered by Elihu Root before the New York State constitutional convention in 1894; also a letter from Mr. Root to Mrs. Alice Hill Chittenden, written May 3, 1915, in which he states that time has not in any way changed, but has rather confirmed his opinion, which he expressed to the constitutional convention of 1894, regarding woman's suffrage.

Some Catholic views on woman's suffrage were read, including the opinion of Cardinal Gibbons; opinion from a newspaper interview in Los Angeles by Cardinal Farley; opinion of Rt. Rev. John C. Foley, Bishop of Detroit, from a newspaper interview in Detroit; opinion of Sebastian Gebhard Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee; from an address on woman's rights and the opinion of Henry Moeller, Archbishop of Cincinnati, from a letter to the clergy of his diocese.

The following additional names of members were enrolled:

Mrs. Samuel Orr, Mrs. A. G. Adams, Mrs. Owen Wilson, Mrs. Walter O. Parmer, Mrs. Joe Morse, Mrs. A. W. Gifford, Miss Lillie Iser, Miss Etta Gifford, Mrs. E. W. Foster, Mrs. Richard A. Barr, Mrs. Charles Sykes, Mrs. T. W. Steger, Mrs. E. G. Buford, Mrs. Lindsay W. Coleman, Miss Fannie Bramlett, Miss Willie Field, Mrs. Lunsford Hollins, Miss Bettie Barry, Mrs. Jas. Cason, Mrs. J. P. Harvill, Mrs. Clarence Lewis, Miss Fannie Lewis, Miss Mary Lou White, Mrs. W. W. Hargraves, Mrs. George W. Fall, Mrs. M. M. Gardner, Mrs. A. M. Tigert, Mrs. L. G. Noel, Mrs. A. W. Harris, Miss M. L. Harris, Mrs. D. H. Donnan, Mrs. T. D. Agerton, Mrs. W. H. Bradford, Mrs. W. S. Vertrees, Mrs. S. J. McConnico, Miss Ebie Morris, Mrs. Charles C. Gilbert, Mrs. W. Settle, Mrs. Hill McAlister, Miss Ula L. Milliken, Miss Ellen

Cockrill Foster, Mrs. William Wilson, Mrs. E. R. Newhauser, Mrs. Thomas D. Traylor, Mrs. Harry Lee, Miss Olivia Clark, Miss Virginia Clark, Miss Mary Taylor, Mrs. Thomas P. May, Mrs. J. Marvin Young, Miss Lizzie Sue Wilson, Mrs. W. H. Ross, Mrs. S. B. Johns, Miss Ludie Wilson, Mrs. P. H. Miller, Mrs. Inman Mitchell, Miss Adelaine Wilkins, Miss Esther Krautz and Miss Willie Wilson.

WISCONSIN

THE Milwaukee Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage at the annual meeting, May 25th, in the Hotel Pfister, passed a resolution protesting against any action taken at the Republican national convention in Chicago which may support or favor woman suffrage. The resolution reads:

To the Honorable Delegates from Wisconsin to the Republican National Convention:

The undersigned officials and members of organizations of women in Wisconsin opposed to the extension of suffrage to women, take this means of protesting against any action of the Republican National Convention at Chicago, June 7, 1916, committing the honorable party which you represent to supporting or favoring as a party the adoption and passage by Congress the so-called Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which would impose upon women without their consent the duties and responsibilities of electors.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION.

We deem it sufficient for us to state as our reason for opposing this amendment at this time:

That it deprives the States of the privilege to determine who shall be voters in the several States.

It would enable thirty-six States, some having but small and scattered population, to extend suffrage in all States without at any time submitting the question to a vote of the State.

As believers in democracy we urge that women should have the opportunity of determining in a lawful method the wishes of women upon such an important change in our domestic relations before such change is made.

MARY L. ATWOOD, *President.*
GERTRUDE S. BEAN, *Secretary.*

THE NEED FOR THE BALLOT.

"Womanhood always has its influence and does not need to go to the polls to maintain it," said Mrs. C. E. Estabrook in an address.

"In the graded schools especially, where 95 per cent. of the pupils leave before their courses are finished, we want the curriculum domestic science," she said. "A resolution urging the school board to continue sewing and cooking in the last four years was recently passed by our association. As the girl is the mother of tomorrow, the home is the foundation for her usefulness. The ballot is wasted time and energy, and is so small a part of what is really vital," she declared.

Mrs. Estabrook was elected president of the organization.

DENVER WOMEN FAIL IN SUFFRAGE TEST

AN interesting—and cheerful—indication that the imaginary improvement of politics through women's votes does not exist in States where women vote is the publication by the Denver, Colorado, *Post* of a bulletin issued by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, printed in full across two columns, as follows:

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, with headquarters in New York, has issued the following bulletin as a comment on the election of Robert W. Speer as mayor of Denver:

DENVER WOMEN FAIL IN SUFFRAGE TEST

The anti-suffragists, who held a cake sale at the headquarters, 37 West Thirty-ninth street, to-day, for the benefit of the campaign against votes for women in Iowa, declared that the re-election of Robert W. Speer as mayor of Denver, Colo., yesterday, by a majority of 12,000 to 14,000 votes, with only 63,000 votes cast, will prove conclusively that woman suffrage is a failure.

The largest vote of women ever polled in Denver, according to Senator Shafroth of Colorado, was 29,085, in 1912. There were 70,585 women over twenty-one in Denver in 1910 and 71,990 men. Had even 50 per cent. of the women over twenty-one voted against Speer he would have been defeated.

Throughout Colorado, the re-election of Mr. Speer has been held up frankly as a concrete test of the value of woman suffrage.

On May 2d Dr. Lillian Pollock, Mrs. Honora MacPherson, Mrs. James H. Teller and Mrs. Jessie Moore, of Denver, in a statement to the Denver *Post*, the largest newspaper and the leading defender of woman suffrage in the Rocky Mountain region, issued an appeal to the women of Denver, asking them to "remember on election day that as women vote for or against Robert W. Speer, so will the cause of suffrage rise or fall in the States where it is an issue."

"These women are in the forefront of the city's builders," asserts the *Post*.

"If I were strong enough I should like to go through the streets of Denver and trumpet the dangers of Speerism," said Mrs. Teller, wife of the supreme court justice, according to the *Post*.

In the communication of May 2d it was said these women "do not want Denver to go back to the old ways when a dolorous sisterhood of sin was herded to the polls like cattle by Speer's trusty men; when saloons were run day and night in defiance of law; when the doors of wine rooms swung in and out all hours of the day and night to lure the feet of youth; when gambling was open and undisturbed as the sky." For years the women of Denver worked to abolish the red-light district.

In a signed statement in the Denver *Post* of May 7th, L. J. Stark, R. W. Hoyt and A. L. Doud, of Denver, made the following allegations in regard to Mr. Speer's candidacy:

"His charter is unquestionably the most colossal monstrosity ever submitted to a people who believe in a representative government. Under Mr. Speer's charter amendment he will hold despotic sway over this city never before conceived of; civil service is practically abolished; the recall is doubtless wiped out, and Mr. Speer will be the czar.

"Under Mr. Speer's former administration there took place in the city of Denver the most stupendous frauds in the way of ballot-box stuffing and repeating and election corruptions that were ever known here, and it made the decent, law-abiding citizens hang their heads in shame and humiliation."

Commenting on this incident, the antis say that "the suffragists will now, no doubt, switch around and declare Mr. Speer an excellent mayor, just as in the case of Hiram Gill of Seattle, Wash., who was re-elected mayor of that city at the very moment that the suffragists were claiming credit throughout the country for his removal from office."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND JURY DUTY

ONE of the disadvantages of circulating suffrage pleas which apply differently in various States is the danger of their becoming ridiculous. An instance of this kind is the printing of an article by Dorothy Dix, recently, in a Denver, Colorado, paper, entitled "Equal Suffrage Would Bring Women Jurors," and stating that "then, indeed, feminine criminals with whom men are clearly unable to deal would get real justice regardless of their tears and entreaties."

Unless this article is based on the technical quibble that there is no "equal suffrage" in Colorado (since women who vote there do not accept equal responsibilities with men in other civic matters), it is an absurd claim to publish in a State where woman suffrage has been in operation for twenty-three years—and *where no women serve on juries.*

Woman suffrage does not always bring women jurors. Neither does Colorado

guarantee that women who vote elsewhere need not serve on juries.

Last year, when the suffrage journal grew alarmed because the laws of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts made women, if voters, liable for jury duty, and many women objected to the franchise for that reason, it printed an editorial stating that in Colorado there were no women jurors, although Judge Lindsey and other suffragists have been trying for years to get them.

Either woman suffrage does not always enable women to get on juries, or else suffragists are trying to play "both ends against the middle" on this argument as on all of the others.

Their argument from either end is fallacious, for the fact that women voters do not serve on juries in Colorado has nothing to do with the laws of another State which make women liable for jury duty—and likewise, where "man-made laws" do not place women voters on juries, Colorado shows that "equal suffrage" does not necessarily bring women to such service.

FALSE FIGURES

The antis have often pointed out the various false statistics used by suffragists. Nearly all of the propaganda for the suffrage cause is "made in Massachusetts" and printed originally in the so-called *Woman's Journal.*

That organ cannot even keep its own files from proving that it uses almost any figures which serve its propaganda at the time, without even examining previous figures.

In an editorial in the *Woman's Journal,* June 3, 1916, it is said: "The General Federation of Woman's Clubs two years ago had less than a million members. Now it has more than two and a half million."

On June 20, 1914, the first page of the *Woman's Journal* published this, in relation to the number of women in the Federation:

"There were 2,094 delegates present, representing 1,907 bodies having a membership of 1,700,000 women."

Which figures are false? The "less than a million?" The "1,700,000?" Or the "more than two and a half million?" A suffragist ought to be able to tell a thing twice the same way, at any rate, but apparently, the contempt for accuracy leads them to neglect even the consistency that is necessary to do this much.

Two well-known actresses who recently sold tickets on Broadway to help the suffrage cause were bitterly disappointed and expressed much public indignation because they were mistaken for two other well-known actresses.

Press agents who allow well-known actresses to be mistaken for others while selling tickets "for suffrage" ought to be shot at sunrise.

NOTES AND COMMENT

ONE of the queerest manipulations of newspaper space to favor the cause of woman suffrage that has ever been made in any political campaign was the publication in the Des Moines, Iowa, *Register and Leader,* of May 24th, of what Colonel John P. Irish, who now bitterly opposes woman suffrage in that State, said in 1870, when, as a suffragist, he "engineered the amendment" through the House of Representatives of Iowa.

Political propagandists have often exposed a man's early life to discount his present opinions, but why any editor should cite a man's opinions forty-six years ago—which that man has since repudiated—on a question that man is absolutely opposing after nearly half a century of additional study and experience, is a new puzzle for the psychologists of politics to work out.

But the most significant and strongest part of the thing is that the editor who ran Colonel Irish's speech of forty-six years ago across three columns of his editorial page less than two weeks before the election, *evidently considered it the best suffrage material he could get,* at this time.

That the foremost editorial advocate of woman suffrage in Iowa should present the argument that an anti-suffragist has discarded, repudiated, and out-grown for many years is the best proof anyone could ask that the suffragists have not only nothing new to say on the subject, but must depend on what an anti-suffragist believed *before he learned better* by experience, for their campaign material.

This is altogether the most comical exhibit any suffragist has ever given of how to think backwards.

The leader of the Pittsburgh suffragists recently said: "As a whole women do not have the solidarity of sex that men have."

A year ago the National Woman Suffrage Association employed a Hungarian woman to tour the country and tell the people that women had more "solidarity of sex" than men, and they would, on this account, "end war."

Women have, or have not, anything the "cause" happens to need at the moment for its propaganda.

A suffragist says she believes "that making a living gives a person discipline that housekeeping does not."

Opinions differ on the discipline, Miss Ida M. Tarbell contending that housekeeping is one of the world's greatest training schools for emergency work, but few will question the statement that good housekeeping is the chief element in "making a living" worth while.

WHY are suffragists going so far back for their latest and most up-to-date arguments?

A suffragist senator recently introduced a treaty signed in 1720 as a suffrage document. A late suffrage paper ran a letter written in the seventeenth century to prove that women should vote in England. And in its June, 1916, number, the *Woman Voter,* official suffrage organ, prints across its cover "The Discovery of Women" as its chief contribution to the "cause."

Adam seems to have beaten the suffragists about 6,000 years in discovering women. But far be it from the antis to criticize any present effort in that direction on the part of the believers in votes-for-women. In a few more years of experience, some of the suffragists may even discover that woman is "different" from man, and after that may begin to learn how and why, thus eventually becoming antis.

If "eventually, why not now," as an advertiser puts it?

The suffragists who planned to wear "ball and chain" at Chicago to show their "slavery" in man-suffrage States did well to select gas bag toy balloons as the appropriate symbol of their subjection. With a sufficient number of these cruel implements bound to her feet a woman might be able to fly heels over head and show that she is not really a "slave," but an angel with a reverse idea of elevating herself.

The G. A. R. of Denver refused to allow women to parade with them "because it would look like a suffrage parade." Even in a suffrage State, it thus appears, it is not now dignified to exhibit men in a manner which might cause them to be mistaken as suffragists!

"Mister, won't you buy a flower to help our cause," said the girl on Broadway to the passer-by.

"Not yet, but soon," replied the man. "I'll send your cause flowers with my compliments as soon as it is laid out."

"Woman suffrage is bound to come"—to grief when people know all about it.

Women vote in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, California, Arizona, Oregon, Kansas, Montana and Nevada.

"One would go to hardly any of them except to get a divorce or attend a prize fight," says the Buffalo *Inquirer.*

Is this the explanation of the small proportion of women in these States, Wyoming, for instance, the oldest suffrage State, having 219 men to every 100 women?

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman's Relation to Government — *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment
Stephen H. Olin

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights
Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc.
John R. Dos Passos
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question
Miss Emily P. Bissell
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism — *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each
Celluloid Buttons.....5c.
Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound
Prof. William T. Sedgwick
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914
Everett P. Wheeler
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage: Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman
Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot
Everett P. Wheeler
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00)
Sir Almroth Wright
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage
Mrs. A. J. George
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage
Mrs. George A. Caswell
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform
Margaret C. Robinson
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1916

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....